DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 630 CG 008 566

AUTHOR Teger, Allan I.; And Others
TITLE The Emerging Student Voter: The Effects of Traditional and Nontraditional Political Socialization on Political Participation.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *College Students; *Political Influences; *Political Socialization; Social Action; Social Change; *Student Participation; Student Reaction; Surveys; *Voting

ABSTRACT

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, American society experienced high levels of student political activity. Through 1970 most of this activity was outside the realm of traditional politics (i.e., demonstrations and protests), but in 1971 the 26th Amendment took effect, enfranchising millions of young voters and changing the arena of political activity. Survey data gathered from personal interviews with 442 undergraduates, collected at yearly intervals spanning the transition period, are presented. These data reveal that, contrary to findings in adult samples, student electoral campaign participation was linked to high political alienation and unrelated to political efficacy during 1970. The last survey, following the 1972 election, indicated findings consistent with the adult population. Additional data suggesting differential impact of agents of the political socialization process on demonstrators and non-demonstrators are presented and analyzed. Turnover of the student body, the type of election campaign, and expressive versus instrumental functions of participation are considered as possible explanations for differences observed over time. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085630

# THE EMERGING STUDENT VOTER: THE EFFECTS OF TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

by

Allan I. Teger, Robert Meadow,

University of Pennsylvania

Stanley Renshon, Herbert Lehman College of C.U.N.Y.

and

Charles Salter, Spring Hill College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 008 566

## ABSTRACT

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, American society experienced high levels of student political activity. Through 1970 most of this activity was outside the realm of traditional politics (i.e. demonstrations and protests), but in 1971 the 26th Amendment took effect, enfranchising millions of young voters and changing the arena of political activity. Survey data gathered from personal interviews with samples of students collected at yearly intervals spanning the transition period are presented. These data reveal that contrary to findings in adult samples, student electoral campaign participation was linked to high political alienation and unrelated to political efficacy during 1970. The last survey, following the 1972 election indicated findings consistent with the adult population. Additional data suggesting differential impact of agents of the political socialization process on demonstrators and non-demonstrators are presented and analyzed. Turnover of the student body, the type of election campaign, and expressive versus instrumental functions of participation are considered as possible explanations for differences observed over time.

# THE EMERGING STUDENT VOTER: THE EFFECTS OF TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Since the time of Plato, participation has been a key concept in the study of politics. While some of our notions concerning who is eligible to participate have changed, the importance of participation for the maintenance of democratic political systems has remained unaltered. Throughout this period, consideration of the concept of participation has emphasized these questions: What is the nature, what shapes the amount, and what are the consequences of political participation?

In the American context, participation can be approached at two levels. First, we can consider participation in the choice of representatives via voting, supporting a campaign, canvassing, or engaging in other forms of electoral activity. At the second level, there is direct participation in politics--both traditional (running for office, lobbying) or, more recently in the United States, non-traditional (protesting, demonstrating). In this paper we shall examine both forms of participation over time among the newest group entitled to full participation--the student voter.

Two general theories of political participation have emerged from the social science literature. First, there is the concept of political obligation, wherein citizens feel they have a civic duty to provide inputs into the political system. Although early scholars have hinted at the importance of this concept (Campbell et al, 1960; Almond and Verba, 1963), recent empirical findings by Levenson (1971) in a re-analysis of Survey Research Center election data suggest that high civic obligation by itself is not strongly correlated with political activity.

The second general theory of participation has focused on the concept of political utility, wherein people participate to obtain positively valued benefits from the system, either material (via budget allocations) or psychic (such as a feeling of power). Wilson and Banfield (1971) have published results of surveys indicating how material benefits are sought through electoral participation, while Kenniston (1967) has concentrated on the psychic rewards of participation prompted by ideological variance with the ruling government. Lane (1959) has also

found in his in-depth interviews that people frequently participate in politics to relieve intra-psychic tension.

Aside from the obligation one may feel or the rewards that are sought, other variables may intervene in the decision to participate. One of the most widely studied of these variables has been alienation. While definitions of alienation are as bountiful and diverse as the number of scholars who have worked with the concept (c.f. Seemans, 1959; Merton, 1957), for our purposes we shall consider it to be a gap between the citizen's value state and the governments policy outputs. Previous research has found that among adults, alienation has led to a decrease in political participation (Rosenberg, 1951; Agger et al, 1961; Rose, 1962; McDill and Ridly, 1962; Almond and Verba, 1963; Campbell, 1962; Litt, 1963; Stokes, 1962).

In the political obligation model, the alienated individual divorces himself from the political system. This can be explained by his feeling no obligation to participate if policy outputs are less than satisfactory. Alternatively, a sophisticated alienate from the system may consider that the role of

being a good citizen entails not participating when the system has alienated him. A final possibility is an application of alienation to the political utility conceptualization of participation. When rewards no longer flow, or when the costs of participation are greater than the benefits derived, isolation from the government will increase, and desire to participate will decrease.

A second variable affecting the desire to participate has been the degree of political efficacy of the voter. By efficacy we refer to how much impact the citizen feels he has on the government and how much the voter feels the government listens to or cares about what he is saying. Previous research has shown rather conclusively that as political efficacy diminishes, so does the desire to participate (Almond and Verba, 1963; Campbell et al, 1960; Dahl, 1961; Berelson et al, 1964; Verba and Nie, 1972). Apparently in order for people to invest the time, ego, or money into political participation, they must feel that they can "make a difference" in the political system.

Still other variables, ranging from demographic variables such as income (Agger & Ostrom, 1956; Lipset, 1960; Dahl, 1961; Campbell et al, 1954), sex (Agger et al, 1964; Almond & Verba, 1963 ), geographic location (Berelson et al, 1954; Campbell et al, 1960; Verba & Nie, 1972), to partisan identity (Campbell et al, 1954; Campbell et al, 1960; Marvick and Nixon, 1961) to exposure to political stimuli (Almond & Verba, 1963; Berelson et al, 1954; Campbell et al, 1960; Verba and Nie, 1972) have been linked with participation.

Most of these results, however, have been determined from survey research on adults. Those studies analyzing younger adults (21-25) dealt with concepts such as job security, mobility, lack of integration into the community, and child rearing as reasons effecting voter turnout (Milbrath, 1965). These problems do not apply to student voters, who have their own community, are highly educated, and are not yet overwhelmed with fiscal or family responsibilities.

It is our contention that the newly enfranchised, younger voters should be studied separately for a number of reasons.

First, widespread non-traditional participation in the form of demonstrations by youth in general, and college students in particular, has led to the prediction that young people might avoid participation in traditional politics. If these demonstrations can be considered indicators of alienation, we can conclude that young people are indeed "alienated". But this type of alienation may differ from the alienation of older voters, which is derived from repeated and long-term isolation from the government. Student alienation arises out of the failure of government to meet the needs of the student, but is not yet internally linked to electoral participation. Secondly, the novelty of participation in electoral politics would encourage young people to at least try the traditional modes of politics despite their alienation. Thirdly, with respect to political efficacy, the feeling of ineffectiveness can arise only after one has tried to be effective within the system. Unless students are willing to assume that because non-traditional politics may have been ineffective, traditional politics is ineffective also, there is no basis for traditional

political efficacy. Furthermore, when we consider the findings of Schwartz and Renshon (1973) that a willingness to participate in demonstrations is linked with high efficacy, we can say that students who have been engaged in protests may feel both high efficacy and high alienation, a unique combination inapplicable to the adult population where low efficacy and high alienation are empirical correlates. Finally, if we can generalize that students are "idealistic" (regardless of the direction of this idealism) we may expect that in elections involving candidates offering a fairly clear ideological choice, student participation should be high.

Analyzing the student participant during the periods 1970-1972 is especially interesting for a number of reasons. While countless studies and Commissions have focused on college protests and protestors (cf Lipset, 1965; Lipset and Altbach, 1970) only one (Dennis and Ranney, 1978) has considered the college student as a voter. Our data bridges the transition period from one of the peak years of student protest--1970 (the year of increased military actions in Cambodia, the campus

deaths at Kent State and Jackson State Universities, etc.) through the first year of enfranchisement under the 26th Amendment in an off-year election, to the first presidential election for which most students were eligible. With this data base we hope to bring some degree of order and empirical validity to the anecdotal assertions made concerning who the student voter-participant is, and what motivates him to act as he does.

## Method

For each of three years, we secured personal interviews of undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania. The procedures for each year are briefly described below.

### First Survey

Subjects. A total of 442 undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania served as respondents in the survey. Subjects were randomly selected by choosing every 10th name from complete class lists, the selection being done separately for each class, freshmen through seniors, in order to insure an equal proportion of each.

The Questionnaire. Interviewers made note of subjects'

sex, and appearance (traditional or "hippy") on the first part of the questionnaire. The remainder of the questionnaire consisted of 58 questions in three major categories: background information, attitudes of the subjects toward politics, and political activity of the subjects. In the first category, subjects were asked about their citizenship, class, major, grade point average, religious preference, sexual activity, drug taking behavior, status and political activity of their parents, and their own prior activity in politics. In the second category, political alienation and political efficacy were measured. In the third category, subjects were asked if and why they participated in campaign activities. They were also questioned about the extent and nature of their involvement in the campaign.

Procedure. Seventy-six members of a course in social psychology served as interviewers for the survey. Questionnaires were administered to subjects during the week following the "unstructured period", an 11-day period during the election of November 1970, in which students were free from classes

to participate in campaign activities. The interviewers talked with subjects in person whenever possible, although a very few (8%) of the interviews were done by phone. The interviewer introduced himself (or herself) and informed the subject that his name had been randomly chosen for an anonymous interview as part of a class project in social psychology. He then read the questions to the subject and wrote down his responses. If asked, interviewers were instructed not to divulge the purpose of the survey, but rather to advise subjects that a report would be forthcoming in the college newspaper. When interviewing a member of the opposite sex, the question dealing with sexual behavior was eliminated.

Second Survey

One year later, subjects from the first study were re-interviewed following the elections of November, 1971. This election was the first time that the 18 through 20 year olds could register and vote in Pennsylvania. Although the university did not suspend classes or exams during this election, the campus showed evidence of a good deal of interest in the election.

The mayoralty race in Philadelphia was the major focus of this election.

Subjects. Attempts were made to re-interview the respondents from the first survey. Out of the 442 respondents in the first study, 107 were seniors and had graduated, and an additional 131 could not be located. This second panel-type survey therefore consisted of interviews with 204 of the 442 students interviewed the previous year.

The Questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire dealt with political activity in the election: whether the subject had registered and voted; where and how he had registered; who he had voted for, etc. A second part of the questionnaire re-assessed the subject's political alienation and political efficacy.

Procedure. Twenty-five members of a social psychology course served as interviewers. As with the first survey, all interviews were completed within two weeks after the election.

Third Survey

A new random sample was drawn from class lists in a procedure

similar to that used in the first survey. Fifteen research assistants trained in survey research conducted the interviews. The interview was similar to that of the previous surveys, but emphasized information and behavior relevant to the Presidential election. A random sample of 247 respondents were interviewed. All interviews were completed within the two weeks following the 1972 Presidential election.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The three surveys outlined above generated data for the period following the 1970, 1971, and 1972 elections. Although one of the original purposes of the study was to examine the variables associated with student voting, the actual voting behavior of the students was often less interesting than the participation of the students in campaign activities. In the 1970 election the students were given time off from their classes under a modified Princeton Plan (Dennis & Ranney, 1973) to work in the political campaign, but they could not yet vote. In the 1971 election the students could vote, but the election was local[1] and thus difficult to compare with the results from

the 1970 and 1972 national elections. In the 1972 election the very high rate of student voting (92% of those registered) made it impossible to locate unique variables associated with voting. Therefore, participation in the pre-election political campaigns, which showed greater variation than did voting behavior, will be emphasized in this paper. Although last chronologicaly, the 1972 presidential election seems to be the best to begin an examination of the student voter.

Table 1 presents an overview of the 1972 Penn sample. They

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

were predominately male, from suburban home environments, Jewish or of no religious affiliation, moderate tending toward traditional in their appearance, and likely to have smoked marijuana. They came from homes in which the parents voted and tended to discuss politics with them, but where the parents were not generally active politically beyond voting. The students agreed with their parents on politics, were moderately well informed regarding the election, and used the newspaper as

their chief source of political information.

Table 2 presents a comparison of the 1972 Penn sample with the results from various Gallup polls. As noted in that table,

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

the students at Penn registered to vote at a very high rate, which was only slightly higher than students in an earlier Gallup national sample. Of those who were eligible, Penn students were much more likely to vote than were a sample of the adult population (86.6% as compared with 54.7%). Although they were just as likely to vote a split ticket as the national sample, they were more likely to characterize their vote as a vote against (rather than for) a candidate than were respondents in a national adult sample. Students at Penn voted for McGovern at a higher rate than would have been predicted from the national Gallup poll estimate of students across the country. Although the Vietnam War and the economy were seen as the major issues by both the Penn sample and the public in general, the war was far more important to the Penn

students with over half of the students indicating that it was the major issue at the time of the election. Our sample also appears to be more liberal and more likely to have registered Democratic than a comparable national student sample.

Table 3 presents an overview of the results of the three

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

surveys. As may be seen in that table, registration and voting rates tended to be high, especially for the national election (1972). Also, students were less likely to work on political campaigns in 1970, a non-presidential election year, than in 1972, a presidential election year, even though the former had been accompanied by a period without classes or exams in order to facilitate student participation in politics. The 1970 participation, however, is still considerably higher than the "gladiators" percentages found in the Dennis and Ranney study (1973, P. 105). Although students were increasingly active politically in 1972 as compared with 1970, they indicate less experience in political demonstrations at the time of the 1972

survey.

Alienation and Political Participation

The participation variable was an index variable consisting of responses to questions asking whether or not a student had solicited votes, leafleted, worked on a voter registration drive, or given money to the campaign. The correlation of each of the individual activities with each other variable in the index ranged from .88 to .93.

The alienation index was derived from three questions: whether the "government represents people with your political and social beliefs"; whether the government seems "willing to do what you think needs to be done"; and the extent of the gap between "your own ideas and those of the government". These questions were intended to relate to the government as a whole, and the last question specifically asked the respondent to consider only the federal government.

Table 4 shows the relationship between these variables and political participation in columns 1 and 2.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

In the first survey, following the 1970 congressional elections, it was found that the students who were most alienated from the government were more likely to work on campaign activities than those who were not alienated ($X^2 = 17.57$, $df = 6$, $P<.01$).

In the second survey, the same questions were asked.[2] The second survey, however, dealt with a local election, the mayoralty race in Philadelphia. As such, the questions which dealt with government as a whole and the federal government in particular had little relevance to the Philadelphia mayoralty race. As a result, all three of the above questions dealing with alienation showed no relationship to the students' decision to register or to vote. However, the second survey did ask one question dealing with alienation which focused specifically on the municipal government. That question asked "When you think of your own ideas and the ideas and action of the Philadelphia municipal government in particular, do you feel there is: no gap at all, a small gap, a fairly wide gap, or a wide gap?" This question could then be considered a measure

of alienation from the local government. Here once again we found a significant positive relationship between alienation and political action. The students who indicated that they were most alienated from the local government were more likely to vote than were the less alienated students ($X^2 = 8.45$, $df = 2$, $P<.02$).

During this local election there was virtually no political campaign activity on campus, and as a result, campaign participation was not examined.

In the third survey, following the 1972 presidential election, there was once again a positive relationship between high alienation and political participation. This relationship, however, unlike those in the first two surveys, was non-significant ($X^2 = 2.50$, $df = 2$, N.S.). Thus, contrary to previous research in which high alienation was linked to low participation in politics, our data suggest that for the student population studied, alienation from the government served to motivate increased political participation and voting, at least in 1970 and 1971.

There are a variety of possible explanations for why the alienated student voter is different from the alienated adult voter. Although the student may be alienated from the government currently in power, he has not yet had sufficient political experience to become alienated from the political system. Adult alienation, generated by many years experience with several administrations is more deeply rooted to the system as a whole. Thus the "naive" current-policy type of alienation showed by the student may disappear over time.

Political Efficacy and Political Activity

The extent to which the respondent felt that he was able to influence the political process was measured by two questions: "whether the government officials care about what people like you think"; and "whether you feel you could be effective in getting the policies you favor adopted by the government." Political efficacy, an index variable created from these questions, was not related to participation in the campaign during the 1970 election ($X^2 = .78$, df = 3, n.s.) nor was it related to registering ($X^2 = 1.09$, df = 1, n.s.) or voting

($X^2$ = .51, df = 3, n.s.) during the 1971 election. However, efficacy and political activity showed a positive relationship which approached significance during the 1972 election, ($X^2$ = 8.54, df = 4, P<.07). This again reflects either the increasing "sophistication" of students as they begin to show the traits of older voters, or reflects a turnover of student voters to include those showing more "traditional" political behavior.

In general the results fail to confirm the usual findings of a strong positive relationship between political efficacy and political participation. This might be due, in part, to the nature of the student experience. Students routinely endure frustration as part of their academic experience. As such, this population may have greater frustration tolerance in terms of inefficacy, yet are still more active than the general population.[3] Therefore, they would be willing to participate in politics even with low political efficacy, and little hope of any successful outcome from their efforts.

The data do indicate, however, as do the alienation data, that the student population is becoming more similar to the

general adult voting population. This change might be due to the change in the composition of the student population over the three years of this study. In 1970, 63% of the students claimed to have participated in demonstrations while only 44.5% made similar claims in 1972. Also, it is quite probable that the intensity of participation in demonstrations by the students was reduced just as the number and intensity of demonstrations all around the country was reduced over this same time period. Thus, the later sample of students had less extensive experience in demonstrations and other non-traditional forms of political behavior. When students had more such experience (1970) they appeared to be motivated by alienation from the government and not deterred by feelings of inefficacy. Students were willing to work to close the gap between themselves and the government, regardless of whether or not they had any hope of success. During their experience in radical politics, one of the largest and longest protest movements in history, they saw very little if any change in national government policies, especially in regard to the Vietnam war. The failure of the protest movement

did not, as predicted, produce student apathy. Rather, as radical politics failed to produce changes, ongoing alienation led students into a new offensive in the realm of traditional politics. Also, the failure of the protest movement had hardened their resolve, and they were willing to participate even with little hope of success. This unique combination began to change, however, as the original protestors graduated and were replaced with students who had little experience with radical politics. Thus, by the time of the 1972 election, the students' political participation tended to be linked to high efficacy and was no longer positively related to alienation. Thus, the usual relationships between these variables and political behavior seemed to be returning. It is impossible of course, to separate the effects of time from the effects of the various types of elections. From 1970 to 1972 the students not only gained additional experience in traditional politics and moved further from the years of extensive protests, but also moved from congressional and local elections to a presidential election. Thus, part of the change in the relationship of alienation and efficacy to political

activity might have been due to the changing nature of the elections. Possibly, it required a presidential election to bring out the usual correlates of political activity in this newly enfranchised population.

Background variables and political participation

Most of the background variables showed little relationship to our participation index. Among those showing no relationship at all were sex, college class, party affiliation, and major subject (although as Keniston (1967) and Dennis and Ranney (1973) have shown, humanities and social science majors tend to participate most.) Religion, another traditional variable, showed small non-significant relationships with participation.

One background variable which did demonstrate a significant relationship to participation was parental income, with students from parents earning higher incomes participating more in the 1972 election campaigns ($X^2 = 15.71$, df = 6, $P<.05$).[4] This supports earlier findings reporting higher participation rates among adults of higher socio-economic status and among students whose father's incomes and occupations were high (Dennis and

Ranney, 1973). Although the 1970 data showed no significant results, those data were in the same direction also.

As may be seen in Table 4, the students whose parents were active in politics were more likely to participate in political activity. A closer examination of the 1972 data shows that students whose parents discussed political affairs with them when they were younger were more likely to participate in campaign activity themselves ($X^2 = 9.99$, df = 2, $P<.01$), as were those who observed their parents taking an active part in politics beyond just voting, such as attending meetings or working for a candidate. ($X^2 = 7.19$, df = 2, $P<.05$).

Although the overall results show a strong influence of early political socialization processes on later political activity, not all students continue to be influenced by their early experiences. When the 1972 respondents were divided into two groups - those that participated in political demonstrations and those that did not - two distinct patterns emerged. Those students who did not participate in political demonstrations showed the strongest effects of early political socialization

experiences. They were more likely to have participated in the political campaign if their parents had been active beyond just voting ($X^2 = 11.12$, df = 2, $P<.01$), and if their parents had talked about politics with them when they were younger ($X^2 = 5.38$, df = 2, $P<.07$). Not only were the non-protestors influenced by their family's political activity, but also by the general pattern of family decision making as well. If they were able to make an input into family decision making as a child, they were more likely to participate in the political campaign ($X^2 = 6.09$, df = 2, $P<.05$). Also, if they felt free to complain at home they were more active in politics later ($X^2 = 7.28$, df = 2, $P<.05$) than were non-protestors. All these variables suggest that the home, serving as a "structual model for politics" (Meadow, 1972) had the most profound impact on those with no "real world" political experiences such as participation in demonstrations.

Those students who indicated that they had participated in political protests showed a very different pattern from that

outlined above. Whereas for the non-protesting students, family decision making and early political socialization were linked with current political participation, no such relationships were found for students who had participated in protests. Instead, the latter group showed a very different set of influences. The extent to which they participated in traditional politics was linked to the use of friends, ($X^2 = 7.69$, df = 2, $P<.05$), personal experience, ($X^2 = 9.97$, df = 2, $P<.01$), and to some extent the underground press ($X^2 = 4.68$, df = 2, $P<.10$) as sources of political information. Thus, the involvement in protest activity served as the critical experience in their participatory political socialization.

Student Lifestyle and Political Activity

There had been considerable concern that students who participated in the "counter-culture" would drop out of traditional society and would avoid participating in the more traditional aspects of the political process. This fear turned out to be largely unfounded. There was no relationship between the use of either marijuana or LSD with participation in politics.

Furthermore, the extent of sexual activity and the presence of a "hippy" style which might also be considered to be indices of non-traditional behavior did not relate to political participation. Most interesting, however, was the finding that students who had participated in political demonstrations were more, rather than less likely to participate in traditional political campaign activities (1970: $X^2 = 5.97$, df = 1, $P<.02$; 1972: $X^2 = 11.79$, df = 2, $P<.01$). Thus there is not a substitution for, but a generalization of participatory behavior. This tends to support the importance of relatively permanent socialization during politically formative years if not altered by early political activity, such as protesting.

Previous political participation was also linked with participation in the 1972 campaign. We found that those who had worked before were much more likely to have worked for a 1972 candidate ($X^2 = 24.11$, df = 2, $P<.001$) than those students who had not. Furthermore, those who worked in political campaigns were more likely to indicate they would work in the future (1970: $X^2 = 5.37$, df = 1, $P<.05$; 1972: $X^2 = 29.66$,

df = 4, P<.001), indicating that the set of campaigners may be fairly stable over time.

The fact that current participation was highly related to predicted future participation clarifies the nature of the relationship between alienation and participation. Dennis and Ranney (1973, p. 117) note that students who participated in political campaigns were more likely to be dissatisfied with electoral politics. They interpret this to mean that participation (presumably unsuccessful) produced dissatisfaction. We found that, similar to Dennis and Ranney, alienation from the political system correlated positively with participation. We interpret this to mean that alienation preceded participation and generated the desire to participate. Our interpretation is given support by the fact that participators are also willing to participate again in the future. If, as Dennis and Ranney conclude, participation produced dissatisfaction, then participators should be less willing rather than more willing, to participate in the future.

Information availability and use had significant impact

on participatory behavior. For those who considered themselves to be well informed about the election ("spectators"), participation rates were considerably higher than for those rating themselves as ill informed ("apathetics") ($X^2 = 27.81$, df = 4, $P<.001$). For those who relied on personal experiences rather than the media or "opinion leaders", higher participation rates were also found ($X^2 = 10.79$, df = 2, $P<.01$), and in fact for those not using television as a source of information about the election, participation rates tended to be higher than for those who did ($X^2 = 5.18$, df = 2, $P<.10$).

Political stance also was related to participation within our 1972 student sample. There was a strong and significant relationship between participation and self-rating on a liberal-conservative continuum with liberals participating to a greater degree ($X^2 = 21.75$, df = 8, $P<.01$). Students who voted for McGovern also participated much more ($X^2 = 14.69$, df = 2, $P<.001$) than those supporting Nixon, although part of this difference may have been due to the hostile campus atmosphere for Nixon supporters, resulting in their unwillingness to wear

campaign symbols or convince friends to support their candidate. Finally, students participated at higher rates if they positively supported their candidate rather than considering him as the lesser of two evils, ($X^2 = 14.35$, df = 2, $P<.001$) and voted <u>for</u> him rather than <u>against</u> the other candidate ($X^2 = 15.14$, df = 4, $P<.01$).

The students were also asked which types of political activity they felt were most effective in influencing the government. For those who felt voting was effective, participation rates were higher than those who did not ($X^2 = 6.06$, df = 2, $P<.05$). For those who felt protesting, political violence, or politicking, lobbying and letter writing were effective, the relationships with participation were smaller and not statistically significant, indicating that perhaps the "gladiatorial" participation of direct campaign work is viewed as instrumental, while lobbying and so forth were regarded as merely expressive.

To summarize, we generally find high participation to be associated with the salience of politics to the student's family, feelings of political efficacy, previous participation,

self information, and a liberal political stance, but when we controlled for antiwar protest, we found that protestors replaced traditional parental socialization with peer and unconventional media influence.

Participation in demonstrations

In the surveys of 1970 and 1972 students were asked to indicate whether they had ever participated in political demonstrations. Columns 3 and 4 of Table 4 indicate the relationships between participation in demonstrations and the various social, demographic and attitudinal predictors. Students most alienated from the political system were more likely to claim to have taken part in political demonstrations in both 1970 ($X^2$ = 38.87, df = 2, P<.001) and 1972 ($X^2$ = 25.7, df = 2, P<.001). Those who felt least efficacious in the traditional political process were also most likely to demonstrate (1970: $X^2$ = 8.09, df = 1, P<.01; 1972: $X^2$ = 6.49, df = 2, P<.05). Thus, those students who felt the greatest estrangement from the system and the least effective within the system were most likely to try out alternate means of influencing the government.

Classifying by sex shows no interesting results, but year in school (class), shows notable results for both surveys. In 1970 older students were more likely to have taken part in demonstrations ($X^2 = 12.13$, df = 3, $P<.01$). Although this comparison was not significant in the 1972 survey, the data tended to go in the same direction. It is interesting, however, that in the 1970 survey all classes except freshmen showed high rates of participation in demonstrations, with only the freshmen class showing a lower rate. In 1972 the senior class was noticably higher than the rest, with the other three classes showing uniformly low rates, indicating a stable drop in protest activity over the years studied.

Major subject showed significant results both times with humanities, social sciences and medical sciences showing the highest rates of demonstrators in both 1970 and 1972. Religion showed significant results both times, with those indicating Judiasm or no religious preference highest among the demonstrators ($X^2 = 15.96$, df = 4, $P<.01$).

Party affiliation did not relate to demonstrations during

the 1970 election but in 1972 Democrats clearly were in the majority of those claiming to have demonstrated ($X^2 = 15.51$, $df = 9$, $P<.01$). Both in 1970, and again in 1972, students with parents in high income brackets were more likely to have taken part in demonstrations (1970: $X^2 = 5.14$, $df = 1$, $P<.05$ 1972: $X^2 = 15.50$, $df = 6$, $P<.02$). As in the case with traditional political participation, students were more likely to have demonstrated if their parents had been active in politics (1972: $X^2 = 5.98$, $df = 1$, $P<.02$).

As expected, participation in demonstrations tended to relate to what might be called the "counter-cultural" lifestyle. Students were more likely to have participated in demonstrations if they lived off campus (1972: $X^2 = 11.27$, $df = 3$, $P<.02$), had engaged in sexual activity (1970: $X^2 = 13.73$, $df = 2$, $P<.01$), used LSD (1970: $X^2 = 27.55$, $df = 2$, $P<.001$), smoked marijuana (1970: $X^2 = 53.57$, $df = 3$, $P<.001$ 1972: $X^2 = 15.98$, $df = 2$, $P<.001$), and dressed in "hippy" style attire (1970: $X^2 = 28.74$, $df = 2$, $P<.001$; 1972: $X^2 = 14.17$, $df = 2$, $P<.001$).

As we noted above, participation in traditional politics

seemed to be the result of a different set of influences for those who had, and those who had not demonstrated. Similarily, demonstrating could also be predicted from a different set of variables for those who had, or had not participated in traditional politics.

The same variables which predicted participation in demonstrations among the students as a whole, also generally predicted demonstrations among those students who had participated in the election campaigns in 1972. That is, the demonstrators who were also campaign participators were less likely to be business majors, were more likely to be Jewish or have no religious preference, were affiliated with the Democratic party, came from high income homes, had parents who discussed politics with them and were active themselves in politics (all significant at .05). They were also more likely to feel alienated from the government, likely to dress in "hippy" attire, and smoke marajuana (all sig. at .001). In short, most of the same factors which predicted demonstrating among the student body as a whole, also predicted demonstrating among those who

also participated in traditional politics.

It is worth nothing, however, that although low political efficacy was related to demonstrating in the student body as a whole, there was no relationship between political efficacy and demonstrations among those who also participated in traditional politics.

Among those demonstrators who did not participate in traditional politics, the story is quite different. For these students, demonstrating could not be predicted by political party, family income, parents political activity, frequency of family discussions of politics, use of marijuana or hippy appearance. Apparently neither their early political socialization experiences nor their current lifestyle were related to demonstrating. Even alienation, a powerful predictor of demonstrating among students as a whole and among demonstrators who also participate in traditional politics, was only marginally influential in determining the demonstrating of the non-participators ($X^2 = 5.97$, df = 2, $P<.10$). What were the factors which predicted demonstrating among the non-participators?

Low political efficacy, which related to demonstrating among the student body as a whole, was still a major predictor of demonstrating in this group ($X^2 = 13.77$, df = 2, $P<.001$). This group also tended to be more likely to protest if their personal efficacy was high ($X^2 = 4.82$, df = 2, $P<.10$). (This is the only group which showed even a slight relationship between personal efficacy and any type of political activity). Non-participator demonstrators were also less likely to use their own friends as sources of information on political decisions ($X^2 = 5.42$, df = 1, $P<.02$). The only similarities among the non-participant demonstrators and the participant demonstrators was that the former also were less likely to be business majors ($X^2 = 11.46$, df = 5, $P<.05$) and had no religious preference ($X^2 = 8.5$, df = 3, $P<.05$).

## Conclusions

Our data appear to indicate that the participatory socialization of the new student voters consisted of two very separate processes. One process was the socialization into the non-traditional politics of demonstrations and into the counter

culture which was associated with the demonstrations. The second process consisted of socialization into traditional politics. Some students experienced both processes, some only one. The data indicate, however, experience in the first process effects the later experience in the second.

For those students whose initial political participation was in the form of demonstrations, their later socialization into traditional politics appeared to be different from the usual pattern. Their willingness to participate in traditional political campaigns was predicted not by parental behavior and early family patterns, but instead by their own experiences, the advice of their friends, and the reports of the underground press. In 1970, while students with experience in demonstrations still constituted the majority of the student population, the nature of student participation as a whole showed marked deviations from the patterns of participation usually found in adults. Alienation, which usually shows a negative relationship to political participation (or sometimes no relationship), showed a positive relationship. That is, the more alienated students

participated more. Alienation from the system appeared to energize their work. Political efficacy, which usually shows a positive relationship to political activity, showed no relationship at all. Students were equally willing to participate whether or not they believed that it would be effective.

Those students who did not demonstrate--whose initial political socialization was into traditional politics--showed patterns of behavior which were similar to those found in earlier research involving adult voters. Political participation was linked to parental political behavior and family decision making patterns. The parents and the family served as a model for political behavior which the young voter than internalized and incorporated into his own political activity. Students who had not participated in demonstrations became the majority by the time of the 1972 election. By 1972, with the number of protestors considerably reduced, overall students participation in politics was again linked to feelings of high political efficacy, and alienation no longer showed a negative relationship to campaign participation.

Our results force us to reconsider the concept of alienation. Although alienation was always thought to reduce political participation, in the case of the 1970 and 1971 elections it energized it. Why? Was the alienated student alienated in a different way from the older alienated voter? Was he alienated only from the government in power but not from the political system? Or was he alienated from the system and did this alienation then motivate him to attempt to change the system to one from which he would not be alienated? A third possibility is that regardless of the source of his alienation, it did not effect his participation in politics because participation for him was more of an expressive act than an instrumental act. This view finds some support in the efficacy data. While demonstrators still constituted the majority of the student population, high alienation was linked to high rates of participation, and efficacy did not relate at all to political behavior. That is, the student's political activity was not altered by the degree to which he believed his actions might be ineffective. If he was willing to participate in campaign

activities without any hope of success, he might be willing also to participate even though he was alienated from the government and/or the system. Participation for such an individual might be purely expressive. Teger (1971) found that support for radical political action on a college campus might very well be motivated by a need for self expression - to confirm ones own self concept as an "involved" radical student. If this is the case, then the aberrant results noted above are not so much a function of the basic political socialization processes as much as an expression of a collective search for identity, or a collective affirmation of an identity peculiar to the activist generation. Nevertheless, those individuals are now no longer identifiable as student voters. They have now entered our general population and many have entered traditional politics. They have brought with them a unique pattern of political behavior - more expressive than instrumental, not easily detered by perceived inefficacy, and guided not by their parents' role models so much as by their own experiences and the experiences and advice of their friends. The students

who followed them, however, resemble the traditional voter in most respects.

Although the protests and demonstrations of the 1960's and early 1970's are over, the participants constitute a considerable proportion of the population. With that in mind, it is of more than historical value to understand the motivations of those who did participate in demonstrations. While the majority of the research on this topic attempts to discuss the demonstrator as though he were from a homogeneous population, demonstrators, according to our data, are no more homogeneous than are participators in traditional politics. Demonstrators appear to fall into two very distinct groups - those who later participated in the political system and those who did not. For those who did participate later, demonstrating was simply a prelude to traditional politics. With the voting age fixed at 21 years while they were still in their late teens, non-traditional politics was often all that was open to them. They participated in demonstrations for the same reasons that they participated in traditional politics - showing significant

influences from the parents' lifestyle and their political socialization at home. They were also likely to demonstrate to the extent that they espoused a "hippy" lifestyle. Their demonstrating thus appeared to be both expressive of their identity as a member of the counter-culture and also, a practice activity which they knew would give way to more traditional political activity at a later time.

The other group of demonstrators - who did not move to the traditional political arena when given the opportunity, appeared to be quite different. They took part in demonstrations, not to the extent that they were influenced by parents, or current lifestyles, but to the extent that they felt inefficacious politically, and efficacious personally. That is, they saw themselves as efficacious people, but trapped in a system in which they could have no effect. They choose, therefore, to operate in a different system. The less likely they were to use their friends as sources of political information, the more likely they were to demonstrate. Thus they might be characterized as loners who had a strong sense of efficacy,

looking for a place in which their abilities might get some results. Once having chosen this road, they were then reluctant to abandon it when permitted to join a system which they had previously regarded as one in which they would be inefficacious. Their behavior might be regarded as more idealistic then either expressive or instrumental. Whether they will return to the traditional political system at a later date, however, is still to be determined.

The results of a counter-culture movement which socializes young people in a non-traditional system was observed to have effects on both those who remained outside of the traditional system as well as those who reentered it at a later time. Demonstrators who enter the traditional political system bring with them a new perspective, which might prove to be a major force in that system. Those who remained outside of the political mainstream did so for very personal reasons - for their initial experience in the counterculture had a different meaning to them than it did to those who returned to mainstream politics. It was not, therefore, participation in a non-traditional

political socialization process itself which affected the student voter, but rather the meaning which that experience had for those who had partaken of it, which determined the individual's later relationship to the traditional political system.

Table 1

PROFILE OF THE 1972 SAMPLE

Sex
- Male.....66.8%
- Female.....33.2

Home town
- Urban.....26.8
- Suburban.....60.2
- Small town.....13.0

Parents Income
- to 9,999.....8.8
- 10 to 14,999...10.6
- 15 - 19,999....16.1
- 20 - 29,999....27.2
- 30 - 50.....23.0
- 50+.....14.3

Religion
- Protestant.....15.8
- Catholic.....17.4
- Jewish.....32.8
- None, other....34.0

Appearance
- Hippy.....19.4
- Medium.....41.4
- Traditional....39.2

Smoked Marij.
- Never.....29.0
- Few times.....29.4
- Many times.....41.6

Parents voted
- Yes.....98.0
- No..... 2.0

Family discussed Politics with
- Yes.....53.7%
- No.....41.3

Parents active besides vote
- Yes.....39.7
- No.....60.3

Agree with Parents on politics
- Yes.....62.6
- No.....37.4

Well informed on election
- High.....35.2
- Moderate.....57.9
- Low..... 6.9

Sources of information on election

| | Used As A Source | Most Important |
|---|---|---|
| Newspaper | 95.5% | 66.4% |
| School Paper | 64.0 | .8 |
| Friends | 79.8 | 8.1 |
| Relatives | 36.8 | 2.4 |
| Campaign Ads | 57.5 | 1.2 |
| Personal Exp | 37.2 | 3.2 |
| Underground Press | 17.0 | 0.0 |
| TV & Radio | 89.5 | 17.8 |

Table 2

COMPARISON OF UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA
1972 SAMPLE WITH VARIOUS GALLUP POLLS

| | Univ. of Penn. | Callup Polls | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Registered to vote | 85.0% | 80.0% | |
| Of those not registered, the reasons for not registering: | | | |
| too young | 53.0 | 38.0 | a |
| no interest (general) | 14.0 | 28.0 | a |
| no interest at this time | 6.0 | 10.0 | a |
| registration was challenged | 6.0 | | |
| not registered as as protest | 14.0 | | |
| other | 6.0 | | |
| % of those eligible who voted | 86.6 | 54.7 | |
| Voted split ticket | 54.4 | 60.0 | b |
| Voted: | | | |
| for a candidate | 34.2 | 63.0 | b |
| against a candidate | 46.6 | 24.0 | b |
| both | 19.2 | 13.0 | b |
| Voted For: | | | |
| Nixon | 16.4 | 47.0 | c |
| McGovern | 79.0 | 49.0 | c |
| Other | 4.6 | 4.0 | c |

Cont'd.

Table 2 Cont'd.

| | Univ. of Penn. | Gallup Polls | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The top issue at the time of the election: | | | |
| Vietnam | 50.6 | 27.0 | d |
| economy/taxes | 14.9 | 27.0 | |
| govt' ethics | 5.7 | 3.0 | |
| poverty/welfare | 1.6 | 3.0 | |
| foreign policy (nonViet) | 3.6 | 10.0 | |
| candidate | 6.0 | -- | |
| other | 12.9 | 27.0 | |
| don't know | 3.2 | 3.0 | |
| Party Registration | | | |
| Democrat | 64.2 | 35.0 | a |
| Republican | 11.1 | 22.0 | |
| other | 4.4 | | |
| none | 20.1 | 43.0 | |
| Political self-rating | | | |
| very liberal | 9.1 | 6.0 | |
| liberal | 61.4 | 29.0 | |
| middle of the road | 15.4 | 49.0 | |
| conservative | 13.7 | 12.0 | |
| very conservative | .4 | 1.0 | |

a - Gallup Poll, Fall, 1971 (students, only)

b - Gallup Poll, Dec., 1972

c - Gallup Poll, Oct. 1972

d - Gallup Poll, May, 1972 (students, only)

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN POLITICS BY STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, 1970 - 1972

| | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Registered to vote % of those eligible | (not yet eligible) | 74% | 90.3% |
| Voted of those eligible | -- | 49% | 86.6% |
| Worked on political campaigns | 16.7% | not measured | 77.7% |
| Claimed to have participated in demonstrations | 63% | not measured | 44.5% |

Table 4

The relationship of demographic, social and attitudinal variables to traditional political participation and participation in demonstrations, 1970 - 1972.

| | Percent of Respondents at each level for each variable who participated in election campaigns of: | | Claimed to have participated in demonstrations when asked in: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1970 | 1972 | 1970 | 1972 |
| **Attitudes** | | | | |
| Alienation | | | | |
| low..... | 4.5%***[a] | 76.5% | 36.0%*** | 15.7%*** |
| medium..... | 13.6 | 68.9 | 53.1 | 26.7 |
| high..... | 21.6 | 80.1 | 73.6 | 52.7 |
| Political Efficacy | | | | |
| low..... | 17.2 | 71.2 | 67.5** | 49.3** |
| medium..... | (not incl.) | 81.2 | (not incl.) | 42.4 |
| high..... | 16.5 | 79.8 | 53.4 | 29.8 |
| **Background** | | | | |
| Sex Male..... | 17.6 | 78.2 | 60.7 | 35.8 |
| Female..... | 15.2 | 76.8 | 66.7 | 48.8 |

Table 4 Cont'd.

| | | Percent of Respondents at each level for each variable who participated in election campaigns of: | | Claimed to have participated in demonstrations when asked in: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1970 | 1972 | 1970 | 1972 |
| Class | Frosh.....20.4 | | 81.8 | 47.4*** | 37.7 |
| | Soph.....13.2 | | 79.0 | 68.2 | 35.5 |
| | Jr.....17.9 | | 70.7 | 65.2 | 39.7 |
| | Sen.....16.8 | | 78.0 | 66.4 | 50.0 |
| Major | Med.Sci....17.9 | | (not incl.) | 66.7* | (not incl.)** |
| | Phys.Sci....15.5 | | 67.2 | 51.7 | 32.8 |
| | Humanities.. 9.5 | | 83.3 | 78.1 | 51.5 |
| | Soc. Sci....20.0 | | 77.8 | 63.7 | 51.1 |
| | Business.(not incl.) | | 86.0 | (not incl.) | 23.3 |
| Religion | None....18.4 | | 72.8 | 77.2** | 51.9** |
| | Jewish.....21.2 | | 85.2 | 67.6 | 44.4 |
| | Prot..... 8.4 | | 71.8 | 51.8 | 23.1 |
| | Cath.....14.9 | | 76.7 | 35.8 | 23.3 |
| Party Affil. | | | | | |
| | Democ.....86.4 | | 83.6 | 75.4 | 49.3*** |
| | Repub.....12.1 | | 73.9 | 75.0 | 8.7 |

| | Percent of Respondents at each level for each variable who participated in election campaigns of: | | Claimed to have participated in demonstrations when asked in: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1970 | 1972 | 1970 | 1972 |
| Parents Political Activity | | | | |
| Low 1 | 11.5*** | 73.8 | 58.5 | 33.6* |
| 2 | 13.2 | | 64.3 | |
| 3 | 17.8 | | 64.4 | |
| 4 | 23.3 | | 71.2 | |
| High 5 | 48.0 | 83.5 | 80.8 | 50.0 |
| Student Life Style - Previous Participation in Demonstrations | | | | |
| No | 10.8* | 72.3 | -- | -- |
| Yes | 20.3 | 84.5 | -- | -- |
| Marijuana Use | | | | |
| Never | 14.1 | 77.5 | 39.2*** | 23.9*** |
| Occasionally | 14.0 | 75.0 | 63.4 | 37.5 |
| Frequently | 19.0 | 80.4 | 81.2 | 53.9 |

Table 4 Cont'd.

| | Percent of Respondents at each level for each variable who participated in election campaigns of: | | Claimed to have participated in demonstrations when asked in: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1970 | 1972 | 1970 | 1972 |
| LSD Use | | | | |
| Never.....14.6 | not | | 55.4*** | not |
| Occasionally....19.6 | included | | 77.1 | included |
| Frequently.....21.6 | | | 90.2 | |
| Sexual Activity | | | | |
| Never.....17.1 | not | | 49.4** | not |
| Occasionally....22.8 | included | | 71.6 | included |
| Frequently.....14.0 | | | 76.5 | |
| Appearance | | | | |
| Hippy.....17.7 | 73.3 | | 81.0*** | 60.0*** |
| Mixed.....19.9 | 79.2 | | 71.4 | 44.8 |
| Traditional.....14.2 | 78.0 | | 49.7 | 27.5 |

[a] Results of a Chi-Square Test on the data in that cell.

* P<.05
** P<.01
***P<.001

Footnotes

1. Also, many students registered at home and cast absentee ballots. These elections often consisted of only propositions and minor offices, and hence made voting even less critical.
2. The data from the 1971 survey were not included in Table 4 as this survey was not as comprehensive as the other two.
3. The authors are indebted to Dr. Alan Zaklad for this observation.
4. The parental income data was not included in the table as the measures were quite different in the two surveys. In 1970 both parents' occupation and income were used as an index, where in 1972 only the parents income was included.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agger, Robert E., Goldrich, Daniel, and Swanson, Bert E. 1964. The Rulers and the Ruled: Political Power and Impotence in American Communities. New York: Wiley.

Agger, Robert E., and Ostrom, Vincent. 1956. "Political Participation in a Small Community." In Political Behavior, edited by Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 138-148.

Agger, Robert E., Goldstein, Marshall, and Pearl, Stanley. 1961. "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning." The Journal of Politics, XXIII, 477-506.

Almond, Gabriel, and Verba, Sidney. 1963. The Civic Culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Berelson, Bernard R., and Steiner, Gary A. 1964. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Campbell, Angus, Gurin, Gerald, and Miller, Warren. 1954. The Voter Decides. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.

Campbell, Angus, Converse, Phillip, Miller, Warren, and Stokes, Donald. 1960. The American Voter. New York: Wiley.

Campbell, Angus. 1962. "The Passive Citizen." Acta Sociologica, VI, (fasc. 1-2), 9-21.

Dahl, Robert A. 1961. Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dennis, Jack, and Ranney, Austin. 1973. "Working Within the System: Academic Recess and College Student Participation in the 1970 Election." American Politics Quarterly, 1, 93-124.

Kenniston, Kenneth. 1967. "The Sources of Student Dissent." Journal of Social Issues, 4, 108-117.

Lane, Robert E. Political Life: Why People Get Involved in Politics.

Levenson, G. 1971. "The Behavioral Relevance of the Obligation To Participate." Paper presented to the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Ill., P. 22.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1960a. "Party Systems and the Representation of Social Groups." European Journal of Sociology, I, No. 1, 50-85.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1960b. Political Man. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1965. The Berkeley Student Revolt.

_____, 1970. Students in Revolt, edited by Seymour Martin Lipset and Peter Altbach. Boston: Beacon.

Litt, Edgar. 1963. "Political Cynicism and Political Futility." The Journal of Politics, XXV, 312-323.

McDill, Edward L., and Ridley, Jeanne C. 1962. "Status, Anomia, Political Participation." American Journal of Sociology, LXVIII, 205-217.

Marvick, Dwaine, and Nixon, Charles. 1961. "Recruitment Contrasts in Rival Campaign Groups." In Political Decision-Makers, edited by Dwaine Marvick. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 193-217.

Meadow, Robert. 1972. "Family Life and Political Life: Freedom in the home and the development of political attitudes", Unpublished paper, University of Pennsylvania.

Merton, Robert. 1957. Social Theory and Social Structure, New York: Basic Books.

Milbrath, Lester, W. 1965. "Political Participation in the States." In Comparative State Politics, edited by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines. Boston: Little Brown, Ch. 2.

Rose, Arnold, M. 1962. "Alienation and Participation: A Comparison of Group Leaders and the 'Mass'." American Sociological Review, XXVII, 834-383.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1951. "The Meaning of Politics in Mass Society." Public Opinion Quarterly, XV, 5-15.

Schwartz, David, and Renshon, Stanley. 1973. "Social Orientations and Political Alienation in Confrontation Politics." In Political Alienation and Political Behavior, edited by David Schwartz. Chicago, Aldine.

Seeman, M. 1959. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 24, 783-789.

Stokes, Donald. 1962. "Popular evaluations of Government: An Empirical Assessment." In Ethics and Bigness, edited by Harlan Cleveland and Harold Lasswell. New York: Harper.

Teger, A. I. The effect of a building occupation on attitudes and images of the conflict. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1971, 1, 292-304.

Verba, Sidney, and Nie, Norman. Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Wilson, J. and Banfield, E. 1971. "Political Ethos Revisited." American Political Science Review, 4, 105-114.